Examiner   JOSEPH R. KOSACK   1626	Interview Summary	10/529,772	DENNY ET AL.	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  (1) JOSEPH R. KOSACK. JRK (3) Leonard C. Milchard.  (2) Rei-Tsang Shiao. (4) (4) (4) Date of Interview: 11 December 2008.  Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: (1) No. If Yes, brief description: (2) May a seached. (3) May a seached. (4) No. If Yes, brief description: (2) May a seached. (3) May a seached. (4) No. If Yes, brief description: (4) No. If Yes, brief description: (5) May a seached. (6) May a seached. (7) No. If Yes, brief description: (8) May a seached. (9) May a seached. (9) May a seached. (9) May a seached. (10) No. If Yes, brief description is the claims (10) May a seached. (10) May a seached with respect to claim 16. (10) May a seached with respe		Examiner	Art Unit	
Date of Interview: 11 December 2008.  Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ ☐ ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		JOSEPH R. KOSACK	1626	
Date of Interview: 11 December 2008.  Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  If Yes, brief description: ☐ Prior art discussed: 3,4,8-11,16 and 19.  Identification of prior art discussed: Friedlos et al.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et all discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enabled rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LA FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, P	TO personnel):		
Date of Interview: 11 December 2008.  Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ ☐ ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	(1) JOSEPH R. KOSACK. JRK	(3) <u>Leonard C. Mitcha</u>	rd. h	
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: 3.4.8-11.16 and 19.  Identification of prior art discussed: Friedlos et al.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement ware reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et all discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enabler rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview.	(2) <u>Rei-Tsang Shiao</u> . K.S.	(4)	4	
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) □ No.  If Yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: 3,4,8-11,16 and 19.  Identification of prior art discussed: Friedlos et al.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) □ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement wa reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et all discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enabled rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the clair allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LAFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LAFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview	Date of Interview: 11 December 2008.		V	
Claim(s) discussed: 3,4,8-11,16 and 19.  Identification of prior art discussed: Friedlos et al  Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement wa reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et al discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enabler rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render to allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LAFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview	Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant	2)⊠ applicant's represent	tative]	
Identification of prior art discussed: Friedlos et al.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et all discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enabled rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render to allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LAFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview.		e)⊡ No.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et all discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enabled rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render to allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LAFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview	Claim(s) discussed: <u>3,4,8-11,16 and 19</u> .			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement wa reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et all discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enabled rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LAFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview	Identification of prior art discussed: Friedlos et al.	÷		
reached, or any other comments: <u>A proposed declaration by William Wilson and the prior art of Friedlos et al discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. A potential 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enablem rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLIC GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LAFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview</u>	Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached	. g)⊠ was not reached. h)	)	
	reached, or any other comments: A proposed declaration discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection rejection was also discussed with respect to claim 16.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where reallowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICINTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONG INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE IN	endments which the examine to copy of the amendments to ched.)  EE ACTION MUST INCLUDE the last Office action has alre ER OF ONE MONTH OR THINTERVIEW SUMMARY FO	prior art of Friedlos first paragraph, en er agreed would renhat would render the THE SUBSTANCE eady been filed, AFIIRTY DAYS FROM RM, WHICHEVER	et al. was lablement ander the claims e claims E OF THE PPLICANT IS ITHIS IS LATER, TO
Joseph L'Kosack EXAMINER 1600				

Application No.

Applicant(s)